

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated December 13, 2005. Claims 1 to 28 are in the application, of which Claims 1, 13 and 14 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

All claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over a newly-cited secondary reference to U.S. Patent 6,389,462 (Cohen). This citation to Cohen replaces an earlier citation to U.S. Patent 5,905,872 (DeSimone), upon which reliance is no longer maintained, although reliance on the primary references has been maintained. Thus, independent Claim 1 was rejected over U.S. Patent 6,477,586 (Achenson) in view of Cohen; independent Claim 13 was rejected over U.S. Patent 5,978,855 (Metz) in view of Cohen; and independent Claim 14 was rejected over U.S. Patent 6,141,689 (Yasrebi) in view of U.S. Patent 6,754,714 (Chebrolu) and further in view of Cohen. These rejections, together with the rejections of the dependent claims, are all respectfully traversed.

Like the former citation to DeSimone, the new citation to Cohen relates to retrieval of information via proxy servers. For this reason, Cohen is deficient for the same reasons as DeSimone, specifically, all communications are via a direct connection (to the proxy server) such that there are not any communications via a referential transfer with another network device.

On the other hand, all claims herein specify that in a communication between first and second computers, there is a communication either by a direct connection between the first and second computer, or by a referential transfer using a connection to a

third computer, such as a network server. The claims herein have been amended so as to accentuate the differences between a direct connection and a referential transfer.

Cohen has been reviewed, but it is not seen to disclose or to suggest two different types of transfers, namely transfer via a direct connection between first and second computers, or a referential transfer between a first computer and a third computer such as a network sever.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the claimed invention would not have been obvious from any permissible combination of the art cited against it, and allowance of the claims is therefore respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office by telephone at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicants
Michael K. O'Neill
Registration No.: 32,622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 110680v1